

law enforcement deescalation training. It provides for grants and training for law enforcement deescalation tactics. It is not enough. We must do more.

In the last Congress, Senator CORY BOOKER of New Jersey led an effort to build bipartisan support for policing reform legislation that national police groups and civil rights advocates could endorse. He worked with TIM SCOTT, a Republican Senator from South Carolina.

They invited me and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM into their deliberations. They were close to making some progress toward our goals, but even if you look at their goals, which I believe were good, they are not enough. Simply to say we are going to ban choke holds or we are going to deal with warrantless searches in a different way doesn't get to the heart of the issue. What is in the mind of these policemen when they are executing their job, doing their duty? Is it the right way to approach things?

These efforts must continue now anew. We owe it to all of the families who have lost loved ones in these horrible acts of brutality and to the families who fear that their loved ones could be next to pass a law that will help ensure justice and accountability in our policing system.

The vast majority of law enforcement officers are appalled and angered by the deaths of Mr. Nichols and others. They deserve our thanks, and I believe they will support bipartisan efforts to prevent such abuses and punish those who commit them.

As I mentioned, Tyre Nichols loved photography. He loved photographing the world as he saw it. One of his favorite images—which appears again and again in his photos—was the image of a bridge. It is time for Members of the Senate to bridge our differences and pass policing reform so that Tyre Nichols' death will not have been in vain.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

LAW ENFORCEMENT DE-ESCALATION TRAINING ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the killing of Tyre Nichols has reignited a national debate about the excessive use of force by police, and rightfully so. This unarmed 29-year-old was brutally beaten by Memphis police officers with an egregious, excessive use of force.

Within the Republican conference, Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina has been our leader on police reform matters, and I have been proud to work with him on bills to help improve policing in our communities and public safety. One of those bills was the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act, which, by the way, was just signed into law last month.

This new law will ensure that all police officers have the opportunity to acquire skills to defuse a potentially dangerous situation like the one we

saw in Memphis. Use of force should only come into play when absolutely necessary, and this legislation will provide law enforcement officers with the knowledge of what alternatives are available to them, which invariably will make their lives better and safer and also protect the life of the individual who is being detained.

This has the potential to save lives and prevent another senseless and entirely preventable tragedy like this from reoccurring.

I am glad this legislation is now the law of the land, and the Department of Justice must implement it as quickly as possible.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, on another matter, last Friday I was in Austin, my home, and had the opportunity to speak at a conference that included some of the leading experts in all things dealing with declassification and government transparency.

It was cohosted by a number of academic institutions in Texas and the Public Interest Declassification Board, or PIDB.

Most of us had never heard of this group before, but the PIDB leads incredible work to help advise the President and the executive branch on ways to modernize the classification and declassification processes which safeguard our national security but also protect public trust in our institutions.

I joined an onstage conversation with my friend Will Inboden, who leads the Clements Center for National Security at the University of Texas at Austin.

We talked about the circumstances under which classification is important. Controlling access to certain sensitive information enables the United States to remain at least one step ahead of our adversaries. It also protects sources and methods that allow us to collect clandestine intelligence and protect the lives of those intelligence professionals who are engaged in collecting that information, as well as the avenues into those sources that are important to collecting this intelligence. Obviously, we don't want to jeopardize either the individuals involved or dissuade anyone from wanting to work with us in the future or to allow some of our access to dry up because it then becomes a matter of public knowledge.

But we know classification is not always the right answer. There are many circumstances in which declassification safeguards our national security.

One example is the way in which the United States Government declassified and shared information with our allies in the run-up to Russia's brutal invasion of Ukraine.

The decision to declassify some important intelligence gave Ukraine enough battlefield awareness to push back after the initial attack and save countless lives. It also unified Western response, leading to quick condemna-

tion of Russia's attack and resources for Ukrainian forces.

Declassification is an important tool with which we share information with our friends and allies around the world, but it is also another way to show the American people what their government is doing. It builds trust and transparency. It inspires confidence in the incredible work that our intelligence professionals are doing, and it equips scholars with the information they need to conduct academic research that informs decision making.

Obviously, there is a very delicate balance between transparency, which drives democratic self-governance, and secrecy, which is sometimes necessary to protect sources and methods of information that are important to protect our national security.

Policymakers and scholars have long debated this balance, but it doesn't often garner much attention in the public square. At least that was the case until recently.

Over the last several months, law enforcement have uncovered classified documents in unsecured locations. For example, documents were discovered at President Trump's home in Florida. They were uncovered at President Biden's home in Delaware and in his private office in Washington, DC. And they were found at the home of former Vice President Pence in Indiana.

All of these discoveries paint a deeply concerning picture, because those of us with access to classified information know that the only appropriate place to view classified information is in a secure setting.

Now, we have no idea—we, as Congress—no idea what these classified documents contain. We don't know who had access to them. We have no insight into the possible ramifications for national security. So there are a lot of unanswered questions that need answers.

This really addresses Congress's unique role, as a coequal branch of government, to provide oversight of the Federal Government. As elected representatives, we have the duty to our constituents and to our country to ensure their government is working for them, and oversight of the intelligence community is a big part of that job, and it is part of the system of checks and balances.

Now, in most cases, oversight happens out in the open at congressional hearings, but this is, obviously, a different sort of case. We are talking about classified documents that were never meant for public consumption.

That is why we have the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that I serve on and the House Committee on Intelligence, both of which were created after the Church Committee made recommendations about oversight that needed to be put in place over the intelligence community—both the police, the community itself, to make sure that those tools were not abused, but also to restore public confidence that